

3.1.19 Executive Orders on Environmental Justice and on Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

Two Executive Orders are relevant to the Proposed Action, and are discussed below.

Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations," was signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. It requires, to the greatest extent practicable, each Federal agency to "make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations."

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Environmental Justice offers the following definition of Environmental Justice:

*"The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies."*¹

The goal of this "fair treatment" is not to shift risks among populations, but to identify potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects and identify alternatives that may mitigate these impacts.

Executive Order 13045, Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

On April 21, 1997 President Clinton signed Executive Order 13045, "Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children." The policy of the Executive Order states that: "A growing body of scientific knowledge demonstrates that children may suffer disproportionately from environmental health risks and safety risks." Therefore, to the extent permitted by law and appropriate, and consistent with the agency's mission, each Federal agency:

- (a) shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and

¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Draft Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns In EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses, July 12, 1996.

- (b) ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.

This Executive Order defines "environmental health risks and safety risks" as "risks to health or to safety that are attributable to products or substances that the child is likely to come into contact with or ingest (such as the air we breath, the food we eat, the water we drink or use for recreation, the soil we live on, and the products we use or are exposed to)."

3.1.19.1 Study Area and Setting

Population Composition

The population data that are key to the analysis of Environmental Justice and Environmental Safety/Health Risks for Children for the Proposed Action include the following race, income, and age characteristics for Los Angeles County and for the Project site:

- ▶ Percent of Minority population (includes: Black; American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleutian; Asian and Pacific Islander; Others; and Hispanic populations). Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. Since some experts consider religious affiliation a component of ethnic identity, the ancestry question on the 1990 Census was used for the "Other" designation. If a religion was given as an answer to the ancestry question, it was coded as an "Other" response.
- ▶ Number and percent of population below the poverty level.
- ▶ Number and percent of population below 18 years of age.

The Project site is located in Soledad Canyon within Los Angeles County (County), outside of the City of Santa Clarita's (City) jurisdiction and is therefore located in unincorporated lands. Currently, the City of Santa Clarita's Sphere of Influence does not extend near to the Project site. Thus, the area is governed by county, state, and federal policies. Two census tracts in unincorporated Los Angeles County encompassing the Project and surrounding areas were chosen as characteristic for this analysis.

1990 Race, Income, Poverty Status, and Age Distribution

The race, income, poverty status, and age distribution information presented is based upon data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census for Los Angeles County and Census Tract 9108.01.

The data used for this analysis was taken from the 1990 Census, and although the data was collected in mid- to late-1989 it is the most comprehensive set of data on population size, income, and racial composition available.

Los Angeles County

As shown in Table 3.1.19-1, the racial composition of Los Angeles County households was predominantly White (65.0 percent) with persons of Other and Black origins following with 13.6 percent and 11.7 percent, respectively. The percentage of Hispanic households was 25.8 percent. As defined by the 1990 Census, persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race, and are also included in the other racial totals. The 1989 median household income for Los Angeles County was \$34,965, however median household income data is not available by race, and therefore mean household income data was calculated and is presented. In Los Angeles County, 14.8 percent of all persons were below the poverty level. Persons of Hispanic origin made up the highest percentage of persons below the poverty level, at 8.4 percent. Persons of White and Other origins were 5.9 percent and 5.1 percent below the poverty level, respectively.

As shown in Table 3.1.19-1, 25.2 percent of persons in Los Angeles County were under 18 years of age. Of these, Hispanic, White, and Other origins represented 5.4 percent, 4.3 percent, and 3.3 percent, respectively.

Table 3.1.19-2 contains information on poverty status and population below 18 years of age for the State of California. The median household income in 1989 was slightly lower in Los Angeles County compared to the State as a whole. The state-wide median household income was \$35,798, while the median household income in Los Angeles County was \$34,965. State-wide, approximately 12 percent of the population is below the poverty level, compared to 14.8 percent in Los Angeles County. The percent of the total population under 18 state-wide is approximately 26 percent, only slightly higher than the total in Los Angeles County, at 25.2 percent.

Project Area Census Tract

Tract 9801.1 includes and surrounds the Project and encompasses populations characteristic of the Project area, as shown in Figure 3.1.19-1. This is a large tract of approximately 30 square miles and includes the eastern portion of the City of Santa Clarita. The population within this tract is likely to be concentrated within the incorporated area of Santa Clarita, with more sparse population in the area surrounding the Project. A characteristic of the Census Tract data for this analysis is the size of the subject census tract. A substantial portion of the land area covered by the Tract includes the Angeles National Forest, where a very small population would be found. Because the tract covers such a large area, populations not affected by the Proposed Action may be included in the data.

As shown in Table 3.1.19-3, the racial composition of Census Tract 9108.01 was predominantly White, (90.6%) with persons of Hispanic and Asian and Pacific Island origins comprising 7.8 percent and 3.6 percent, respectively. The tract's mean household income was \$72,605, considerably higher than the County's mean household income of \$47,252. Similarly, the tract's median household income of \$61,461 was substantially higher than the County median income of \$34,965. White and Asian and Pacific Islander incomes were higher than the tract's mean income at \$73,561 and \$80,053, respectively. Approximately 3.2 percent of the tract's population was below the poverty level, a considerably lower proportion than in the County of

Table 3.1.19-1

1990 RACE, INCOME, POVERTY STATUS, AND POPULATION BELOW 18 YEARS OF AGE FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY

	TOTAL	White	Black	American Indian, Eskimo & Aleutian	Asian & Pacific Islander	Other	Hispanic Origin *
Number of Households	2,994,343	1,944,923	350,723	15,012	277,438	406,247	772,283
Percent of Total	---	65.0%	11.7%	0.5%	9.3%	13.6%	25.8%
Household Income in 1989							
Less than \$5,000	142,450	74,248	29,225	846	16,474	21,657	40,393
\$5,000 - 9,999	240,610	139,021	47,584	1,484	16,432	36,089	69,058
\$10,000 - 14,999	225,368	129,762	32,649	1,300	18,678	42,979	78,055
\$15,000 - 24,999	455,030	265,921	60,556	2,490	36,029	90,034	160,493
\$25,000 - 34,999	434,946	270,188	52,059	2,357	36,143	74,199	136,090
\$35,000 - 49,999	518,283	340,945	53,390	2,761	49,310	71,877	136,602
\$50,000 - 74,999	519,060	363,211	47,947	2,386	56,001	49,515	103,214
\$75,000 - 99,999	223,273	166,955	16,709	823	25,592	13,194	30,092
\$100,000 +	235,323	194,672	10,604	565	22,779	6,703	18,286
Median Household Income in 1989	\$34,965						
Aggregate Household Income in 1989	\$141,490,185,722	\$102,955,575,563	\$11,653,782,375	\$556,504,539	\$13,471,107,350	\$12,853,215,895	\$25,938,172,131
Mean Household Income in 1989	\$47,252	\$52,936	\$33,228	\$37,071	\$48,555	\$31,639	\$33,586
Total Population	8,863,164	5,044,718	990,406	43,689	955,329	1,829,022	3,306,116
Persons below poverty level **	1,308,255	523,435	203,286	7,225	124,614	449,695	744,383
Percent of total population below poverty level **	14.8%	5.9%	2.3%	>0.1%	1.4%	5.1%	8.4%
Persons below 18 years of age	2,232,294	1,086,947	285,928	11,046	246,820	661,794	1,162,385
Percent of total population below 18 years of age	25.2%	12.2%	3.2%	0.1%	2.8%	7.5%	13.0%
* Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race, and are included in the other racial totals. Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.							
** Persons for whom poverty status was determined.							
Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census, Database: C90STF3A							

Table 3.1.19-2

**1990 POVERTY STATUS, AND POPULATION
BELOW 18 YEARS OF AGE FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

	TOTAL	White	Black	American Indian, Eskimo & Aleutian	Asian & Pacific Islander	Other	Hispanic Origin *
Median Household Income in 1989	\$35,798						
Total Population	29,760,021	20,555,653	2,198,766	248,929	2,847,835	3,908,838	7,557,550
Persons below poverty level **	3,627,585	1,821,146	437,201	44,746	402,161	922,331	1,598,213
Percent of total population below poverty level **	12.2%	6.1%	1.5%	0.2%	1.4%	3.1%	5.4%
Persons below 18 years of age	7,739,461	4,771,819	661,286	70,584	806,879	1,428,893	2,649,198
Percent of total population below 18 years of age	26.0%	16.0%	2.2%	0.2%	2.7%	4.8%	8.9%
* Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race, and are included in the other racial totals. Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.							
** Persons for whom poverty status was determined.							
Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census, Database: C90STF3A							

Table 3.1.19-3
1990 RACE, INCOME, POVERTY STATUS, AND PERSONS
BELOW 18 YEARS OF AGE FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY CENSUS TRACT 9108.01

	TOTAL	White	Black	American Indian, Eskimo & Aleutian	Asian & Pacific Islander	Other	Hispanic Origin *
Number of Households	3,262	2,956	74	5	118	109	254
Percent of Total	---	90.6%	2.3%	0.2%	3.6%	3.3%	7.8%
Household Income in 1989							
Less than \$5,000	26	26	0	0	0	0	6
\$5,000 - 9,999	61	61	0	0	0	0	9
\$10,000 - 14,999	40	36	0	0	0	4	4
\$15,000 - 24,999	149	144	0	0	0	5	5
\$25,000 - 34,999	202	190	0	0	0	12	25
\$35,000 - 49,999	620	543	19	0	21	37	49
\$50,000 - 74,999	1,012	862	50	5	58	37	68
\$75,000 - 99,999	596	557	5	0	20	14	45
\$100,000 +	456	537	0	0	19	0	43
Median Household Income in 1989	\$61,461						
Aggregate Household Income in 1989	\$236,837,350	\$217,445,230	\$4,275,567	\$265,000	\$9,446,258	\$5,405,295	\$16,323,478
Mean Household Income in 1989	\$72,605	\$73,561	\$57,778	\$53,000	\$80,053	\$49,590	\$64,266
Total Population	10,294	9,194	228	78	339	455	1,073
Persons below poverty level **	332	294	0	6	0	32	88
Percent of total population below poverty level **	3.2%	2.9%	0.0%	>0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.9%
Persons below 18 years of age	3,316	2,891	84	38	130	173	392
Percent of total population below 18 years of age	32.2%	28.1%	0.8%	0.4%	1.3%	1.7%	3.8%
* Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race, and are included in the other racial totals. Totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.							
** Persons for whom poverty status was determined.							
Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census, Database: C90STF3A							

Los Angeles. Of the tract's 3.2 percent, 2.9 percent were White, and all other racial categories comprised less than 1 percent of the population below poverty.

Table 3.1.19-3 also presents the number and percent of total population who were below 18 years of age. Census Tract 9108.01 had a total of 3,316 persons below the age of eighteen, representing a total of 32.2 percent of the population within the tract. White children comprised 28.1 percent of the total population, while Hispanic, Other, and Asian and Pacific Islander children constituted 3.8 percent, 1.7 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively. All other racial groups made up approximately 1 percent of the population within the Census Tract.

In general, a greater percentage of the population within the census tract was under 18 years of age as compared to the population of Los Angeles County. The population below 18 comprises 32.2 percent of the Census Tract population, as compared to the County, which has 25.2 percent of the population below 18 years of age. This may be attributed to the fact that some areas in the eastern portion of the City of Santa Clarita are included within this tract's boundary. The Santa Clarita Valley has been experiencing rapid growth in terms of residential, commercial, and industrial development, therefore attracting younger families.

Poverty Thresholds

Nationwide

The poverty statistics presented in this section are based on a definition developed by the Social Security Administration (SSA) in 1964, revised in 1969 and 1981 by the interagency committees, and represents the poverty thresholds for the U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census. This definition was established as the official definition of poverty for statistical use in all Executive departments by the Bureau of the Budget in 1969. The poverty index is a nationwide representation of thresholds that are adjusted for family size, number of children under 18 years of age, and farm-nonfarm residence. The poverty thresholds are increased each year by the same percentage as the annual average Consumer Price Index. Table 3.1.19-4 shows the poverty thresholds in 1990 by size of family and number of related children under 18 years of age.

Los Angeles County

The federal government has established poverty thresholds for households based on a region's median income. This definition of poverty consists of a sliding scale based on the number of persons in each household, and recognizes that larger families will need more money to live adequately compared to smaller families or single persons. Table 3.1.19-5 presents the 1989 thresholds for Los Angeles County, which is based on information taken from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. In 1989, for example, the threshold for very low income for a single person was \$13,950, compared to \$21,550 for a family of five, as indicated in the table.

Table 3.1.19-4
NATIONWIDE POVERTY THRESHOLDS IN 1990, BY SIZE OF FAMILY & NUMBER OF RELATED CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS

Size of Family Unit	Weighted Average Thresholds	Related Children Under 18 Years											
		None	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or more			
One person (unrelated individual)	\$6,652												
Under 65 years	\$6,800	\$6,800											
65 years and over	\$6,268	\$6,268											
Two persons	\$8,509												
Householder under 65 years	\$8,794	\$8,752	\$9,009										
Householder 65 years and over	\$7,905	\$7,900	\$8,975										
Three persons	\$10,419	\$10,223	\$10,520	\$10,530									
Four persons	\$13,359	\$13,481	\$13,701	\$13,254	\$13,301								
Five persons	\$15,792	\$16,257	\$16,494	\$15,989	\$15,598	\$15,359							
Six persons	\$17,839	\$18,693	\$18,773	\$18,386	\$18,015	\$17,464	\$17,137						
Seven persons	\$20,241	\$21,515	\$21,650	\$21,187	\$20,864	\$20,262	\$19,561	\$18,791					
Eight persons	\$22,582	\$24,063	\$24,276	\$23,839	\$23,456	\$22,913	\$22,223	\$21,505	\$21,323				
Nine persons or more	\$26,848	\$28,946	\$29,087	\$28,700	\$28,375	\$27,842	\$27,108	\$26,445	\$26,280	\$25,268			

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 3.1.19-5

INCOME THRESHOLDS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY: 1989

Standard	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very Low Income	\$13,950	\$15,950	\$17,950	\$19,950	\$21,550	\$23,750	\$24,750	\$26,330
Low Income	\$21,350	\$24,300	\$27,350	\$30,400	\$32,300	\$34,200	\$36,150	\$38,000
Median Income	\$26,688	\$30,375	\$34,188	\$38,000	\$40,375	\$42,750	\$45,188	\$47,500
Moderate Income	\$32,026	\$36,450	\$41,026	\$45,600	\$48,450	\$51,300	\$54,226	\$57,000
Source: Santa Clarita General Plan, 1991								

As shown in Tables 3.1.19-4 and 3.1.19-5, Los Angeles County has a higher income threshold for poverty level than the nationwide statistics. While a household of four, based on nationwide statistics, has a poverty threshold of approximately \$13,000, the very low income level for a household of four in Los Angeles County is approximately \$19,000. The difference is even greater when comparing the thresholds for a single person. The nationwide poverty threshold for an individual under 65 years of age is \$6,800, while very low income level for a single person in Los Angeles County is \$13,950.

3.1.19.2 Consequences**Impact Significance Criteria**

According to EPA's guidelines on Environmental Justice, a minority community is disparately affected when that community will bear an uneven level of health and environmental effects compared to the general population. Further, a minority population would be affected if the minority population percentage of the affected area is "meaningfully greater" than the minority population percentage in the general population or other "appropriate unit of geographic analysis."²

Analysis of the Proposed Action in Terms of Executive Orders on Environmental Justice and Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children**Environmental Justice**

The minority population in the Project area, as represented by surrounding Census Tract, is significantly smaller than the minority population in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles

² U.S.E.P.A., Draft Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses, July 12, 1996.

County. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in disproportionate impacts to minority populations.

The median household income in Census Tract 9108.01 was \$61,461, substantially higher than the countywide median income of \$34,965. Similarly, the percentage of persons living below the poverty level, 3.2 percent in Tract 9108.01 was at least less than half of the county percentage (14.8). According to the most recent Census data, since there is not a substantial population of low income residents in the Project area, the Project would not result in disproportionate impacts to low income populations.

Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children

Through an analysis of the most recent Census Tract data for the area including and surrounding the Project, it has been determined that up to 32 percent of the population in the surrounding area was under the age of 18. (As stated previously, the data used for the analysis of Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children was taken from the 1990 Census, which is the most recent Census data available.) It may be assumed from the composition of Census Tract 9108.01 that the majority of the population in that tract lived within the incorporated City of Santa Clarita, and not in the more rural areas near the Project site.

Because a substantial proportion of the population within the Project area were children under 18 years of age, this document must address potential disproportionate health and safety risks to children associated with the Proposed Action. Potential health and safety risks to children from the Project include water quality, noise and vibration, air quality, and public health and safety.

Water Quality Impacts to Children

The potential for surface water and groundwater degradation from the Project is discussed in Section 3.1.4. Any groundwater impacts that result in children contacting or ingesting contaminated water would be considered significant.

All impacts to water quality are mitigated to a less than significant level, as discussed in Section 3.1.4. Therefore the children living in the Project area will not be subject to disproportionate risks from effects of the Project on water quality.

Noise and Vibration Impacts to Children

The potential for noise and vibration impacts to children from the Proposed Action result from blasting, onsite operations, and Project-related use of local roads. Potential noise and vibration impacts are discussed in detail in Section 3.1.5.

The area surrounding the Project is mountainous and the terrain will shield some sensitive receptors from noise impacts in the Project area. Primary land uses in the area are surface mining, open space, and rural residences. Few sensitive receptors are currently located in the area. The dwellings closest to the Project include a single-family home located over 2,000 feet

east of the eastern site boundary, a single-family home located approximately ¼ mile south of the south-central boundary, and the River's End Trailer Park located approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the southwest corner of the site. The rural community of Agua Dulce is located approximately four miles from the central area of the Project site.

Based on Census Tract Block data, approximately six percent of the housing units in the Census Tract are mobile homes and approximately 76 percent are single-family detached homes. Up to 32 percent of the population in the Census Tract is below the age of eighteen.

A new mobile home park is proposed for the area immediately west and northwest of the Project site. The proposed Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park would be a potential sensitive receptor if approved and constructed. It has been assumed that the distribution of children in the proposed Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park would be comparable to the distribution of children in the Census Tract.

Construction Noise Impacts to Children

Section 3.1.5 discusses the construction noise impacts of the Project. Construction noise impacts to children would be considered significant if any sensitive receptor sites housing children, such as schools, daycare centers, or residences, were located within the area impacted by noise from construction. The nearest residence to the construction effort is located approximately ¼ mile from the nearest site boundary, but is 3,000 feet from the area of active construction. No schools, daycare centers, or other sensitive receptors are located closer to the site. Because of local terrain and the distances between the construction sites and any sensitive receptors, children living in the Project area will not be subject to disproportionate risks from construction noise.

Operational Noise Impacts to Children

Section 3.1.5 discusses the operational noise impacts associated with the Project. Operational noise impacts to children would be considered significant if any sensitive receptor sites with children, such as schools, daycare centers, or residences, were located within the area(s) impacted by noise from operations.

Onsite activities that will generate noise include: blasting operations in conjunction with excavation; use of heavy equipment for excavation and transport; and processing facility and batch plant operations.

Blasting operations may raise single-event levels and cause brief noise intrusion. The nearest sensitive receptor to blasting operations is the residence located approximately ¼ mile from the nearest site boundary. The calculated noise value expressed in Section 3.1.5 is considered less than significant. Although Project-induced ground vibrations are not considered significant, vibration may be perceptible from surrounding residences. TMC will conduct a public awareness program to notify local residents and businesses of the blasting schedule (see Mitigation Measure N1).

No significant impacts to the nearest existing sensitive receptors from excavation noise are anticipated because the intervening topography will shield receptors. If the proposed Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park is approved and constructed, some lots will be within the 65 CNEL noise contour for operations and could experience significant noise impacts. While some children may be affected by the Project, it would not be disproportionate to the population of the Tract.

To the extent the Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park is considered for approval in the future, state policy under SMARA includes guidelines whereby land uses that are incompatible with and encroach onto identified or designated mineral deposits (including high or low density residential) must mitigate the incompatibility. The County's General Plan implements this state policy. For example, the General Plan requires proposed development be designed to not inhibit the future development of extractive surface mining development, and to make provisions to buffer the proposed land use from existing or future mineral resource activity.

For these reasons, if future development of the Bee Canyon project were to result in potential impacts on sensitive receptors in Bee Canyon from blasting occurring on the TMC project site, located on a designated resource area, the potential impact would need to be mitigated through conditions, including buffers if feasible, imposed on the Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park.

Processing Facility and Batch Plant Operations will result in onsite noise which will have no significant impacts to sensitive receptors.

Offsite Vehicle Travel Noise Impacts to Children

Noise generation from offsite vehicle travel will occur along material haul routes and routes of employees commuting to work at the Project site. Offsite Vehicle Travel Noise impacts to children would be considered significant if any sensitive receptor sites with children, such as schools, daycare centers, or residences, were located within the area(s) impacted by traffic noise generated by the Project.

Section 3.1.5 discusses potential noise generation based on traffic estimates for the Project. The majority of trips related to the site would be on Soledad Canyon Road. Table 3.1.5-8 presents noise contours for Soledad Canyon Road. Implementation of the Project could extend the 65 dBA contour to encompass sensitive receptors within the River's End Trailer Park. The resulting traffic noise at the River's End Trailer Park represents a 5 dBA increase in noise at the receptor location. This is considered a significant impact and will be mitigated (see Mitigation Measure N3) through the installation of an appropriate soundwall, or berm. No other impacts to sensitive receptors due to offsite vehicle travel noise will result. While some children may be affected by the Project, it would not be disproportionate to the population of the Tract.

If approved and constructed, the proposed Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park would contain two lots within the 65 CNEL for traffic noise and could experience significant noise impacts. Because the Bee Canyon Project has not been approved and it is unknown whether children would be present, impacts are not considered significant.

Air Quality Impacts to Children

Project-related air quality impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in Section 3.1.7. Most Project-related air quality impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. Air Quality impacts to children would be considered significant if any sensitive receptor sites with children, such as schools, daycare centers, or residences, were located within the area(s) impacted by pollutants exceeding the most stringent air quality standards.

After mitigation, the criteria pollutants NO_x, ROG, CO, and PM-10 from exhaust and dust emissions remain significant. Proposed mitigation measures included in Section 3.1.7.3 will reduce exhaust and dust emissions to the maximum extent feasible. However, when Project impacts are summed, the residual impact is expected to remain significant for NO_x, ROG, and PM-10 emissions in Phase 1, and for CO, NO_x, ROG and PM-10 emissions in Phase 2.

Because operations impacts cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, dispersion modeling was performed to determine the potential for significant impacts of residual NO_x, ROG, CO, and PM-10 emissions on proximate receptors. Proximate receptors are the existing and proposed residential uses nearest the Project. The locations modeled included the nearest dwelling unit (south of the site, approximately ¼ mile from proposed operations), the River's End Trailer Park, and the proposed Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park. The modeling analysis is described in Section 3.1.7.4. The results of modeling for Phase 1 indicate that Project emissions will not cause an exceedance of the most stringent air quality standards at any of the receptor locations modeled. The results of modeling on Phase 2 predict that Project emissions will not cause an exceedance of the most stringent air quality standards at any of the receptors modeled. However, the Phase 2 modeling does predict an exceedance of the most stringent air quality standard for NO_x (hourly) at the nearest dwelling unit when existing background levels are added. However, because the analysis is based on a worst-case scenario and the model does not take into account changes in elevation, it is unconfirmed that the standard will be exceeded during normal Phase 2 operations at this location.

Because modeling indicates that remaining air quality impacts will not cause adverse impacts to the nearest receptor locations, children living in the Project area will not be subject to disproportionate risks from Project-related air quality impacts.

Health and Safety Impacts to Children

The potential Project-related impacts to public health and safety are discussed in Section 3.1.13. Health and safety impacts to children would be considered significant if Project activities endanger children in the Project vicinity.

The main environmental safety issues associated with the Project include public health risks associated with potential spills of fuels or hazardous materials, and safety issues involving public access in and around the Project area. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures in Section 3.1.13.3 will reduce potential public safety impacts to a less than significant level, therefore, children in the Project area will not be subject to disproportionate risks from Project-related public health and safety impacts.